



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE SCHOOL REVIEW

A JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

VOLUME XIII
NUMBER 9

NOVEMBER, 1905

WHOLE
NUMBER 129

THE SCHOOL AND THE CHURCH

WILLIAM D. PARKINSON
Waltham, Mass.

There is now in process a curious interchange of courtesies between the church and the public school. On one hand, we hear churchmen bewailing the godlessness of the public school, ascribing to its failure in moral instruction the prevailing lawlessness and irreverence of young America, and urging as a great and pressing reform the introduction into public schools of the method employed by the church in its Sunday schools to stir the deepest depths of child nature. On the other hand, we hear schoolmen complaining of the utter inadequacy and inanity of the Sunday school, from which their children come home with most crude and fantastic notions of religion, and with no conception of any connection between it and the world of reality; and urging the introduction into Sunday schools of the more sane and rational methods of the public school.

The colleges and universities from their celestial vantage-ground echo both these complaints and demands. Equally with the schoolmaster they lament that their students, after years of international Sunday-school lessons with their moralized tidbits and grasshopper progression, are too ignorant of the Bible to read intelligently secular literature which contains Scripture allusions however obvious and direct, and they appeal to the public school to take up the Bible as literature, and so to make good the defects of the Sunday school.

Equally, too, with the churchmen they bemoan the absence of

moral instruction in the public school, and are quite as strenuous for more of the moral element in the teaching of public schools as for more of the element of intelligence in that of Sunday schools.

Several representatives of prominent universities have been heard from upon this subject. They have covered the field widely, and illuminated portions of it with varying intensity. It is a little difficult to reconcile and focus the somewhat divergent rays of their several candles. One is embarrassed at the outset by a vagueness in the use of the term "moral instruction," and by the widely different views as to what are the ultimate aims of the public school and the ideals which control, or should control, in its present management.

The president of one university, while applauding the public school as perhaps the most efficient engine of civic and social adjustment, declared intellectual training to be its primary aim, lamented that thus far moral training had had no recognition in any fundamental school law, and only a very incidental and insignificant part in school administration; and pleaded for the introduction of ecclesiastical training into the schools. To him, then, moral training seems to be synonymous with ecclesiastical instruction.

The president of another university bewailed the passing of the ungraded school, where thought lived and the teacher dominated the atmosphere of the child; recognized in the excessive massing of children in the schools of today opportunity for disciplinary drill, but not for real education; he, too, assumed that the fundamental purpose of the public school is to supply the tools of thought, and regretted that, as it is now constituted, there is no way of permeating it with the real spirit of education. Singularly in contrast with his view of the intellectual aim of the school he conceived the highest function of the college to consist, not in scholastic training, but in getting hold of the spirits of men and molding them by and for community life. To him moral training seems to mean a training of the spirit in that civic and social virtue which our previous witness found the public school already inculcating more effectively than any other agency; but to his mind such training is not to be looked for in the public schools as now constituted.

A representative of another university went to the root of the matter by declaring that morality is a question not of action but of

motive; that the ideal education must deal, therefore, with the motive; that the only true motive is the religious motive; that, therefore, the whole scheme of education should rest upon the sanctions of religion, and that religious and secular instruction cannot be separated into times and seasons, however frequent their alternation, but must be blended throughout. To him moral instruction is authoritative religious instruction, and is the primary aim of all education.

Another president declared, in turn, that morality is entirely distinct from dogma; that moral action is action in harmony with the laws of personal and social well-being; that through the various studies of the school these laws are presented and exemplified and enforced in a thousand ways without trespassing upon the domain of religion; that these lessons are the more impressive for being incidental; and that children do not need to have morals appended to every lesson or compacted into books. To him moral training means influencing to a right attitude toward life. And yet before concluding he, too, reverted to the doctrinal view, and pleaded for suitable textbooks of ethics and for a restoration of Bible study to the public school.

What, then, shall the schoolmaster take moral training to be? In this connection it is pertinent to refer to a remarkable utterance of the president of Harvard University, pointing out certain particulars in which he says the results of public education have been disappointing. Briefly, he maintains that in spite of our educational system the intelligence of the public is still insufficient to deal with the barbarous vice of drunkenness, to eradicate the foolish practice of gambling, to insure a proper exercise of the suffrage, to suppress or exterminate criminals, to elevate the tone of literature and the stage, to withstand the wiles of the patent-medicine fakir, to avoid industrial conflicts plainly disastrous to the interests of all concerned, to abolish the undemocratic, corrupting, and inefficient patronage system, to promote continuous enlargement in mind and character of the individual throughout life, which is the very essence of education.

Evidently President Eliot takes a larger view of the function of public education than do those who regard moral training as a mere

incident of public education, and demands of the school civic and social results larger even than President Wilson of Princeton expects from the ideal university, or from the community life of an unabridged college course. To be sure, President Eliot expressly disclaims reference to the moral disposition of the people, and ascribes the defects he points out to a lack of reasoning power. But if he includes the correction of these defects under the head of intellectual training, he uses that term in a broader sense than that in which the others evidently employ it, and adds another difficulty to our already difficult task of discriminating between moral and intellectual training and of determining which is the chief end of the public school. For it is evident that if the burden, or any share of the burden, of overcoming these fundamental social failings is to be laid upon the school, its duty in this regard cannot be held secondary or incidental to more important pursuits. We must at once recognize that those little intellectual accomplishments of which schools are wont to make display are of trifling import as compared with these larger ends.

Plainly, these shortcomings which President Eliot enumerates have no direct reference to any of the studies of the curriculum. The influence which the school may have upon society in any of these particulars does not depend upon the student's familiarity with branches of study, but must be rather a result of the life he lives while pursuing the duties of the school. The studies themselves, then, are secondary. They become mere occupations, industries, variations of that current of experience out of which the life is wrought and its real lessons learned; and the subjects, therefore, are not to be chosen or taught as if they were ends in themselves, but the teacher's eye must be fixed upon the effect each step is to have upon the life of the little community under his charge.

And here comes President Carrol D. Wright, declaring that the true teacher is not a mere instructor but is first of all an interpreter of life. In his view, moral training is training in right living. It takes its place as the prime function of the school, and intellectual training becomes incidental.

Here, then, the schoolmaster has an ample election. Shall he conclude with one expert that moral instruction is one with ecclesiastical instruction, and that it is to be secured only by grafting the

Sunday-school method upon the public school, or with another that moral instruction has no connection with dogma, and is already being given in the public school more effectively than in the Sunday school? Or, going deeper, shall he decide with Dr. Pace that morals are sound only when based upon religious motives, and that the religious basis must manifest itself, not occasionally, but incessantly, by outcroppings at the surface; or shall he infer from Dr. Eliot that the essence of moral instruction is discipline of the reasoning faculty, and therefore cease to appeal to motives other than reason?

These two views last stated seem as diametrically opposite in the realm of education as do the autocratic and democratic principles in the realm of government. But we are finding that even democracy and autocracy are not so incompatible as we once supposed. Already democracy has come to seek salvation in municipal affairs through the agency of its own chosen autocrat. And we may yet find a way of reconciling these apparently conflicting educational doctrines, set forth as they are, the one by a representative of The Catholic University, the other by the head of a university once characterized by an orthodox oracle as "an essentially pagan institution." The two guides together may even prove to lead us upon a safer trail than either alone.

We find it easy to assent to the premises laid down by Dr. Pace. That religion is the root of sound moral character most of us readily agree. It is as hard to gainsay the proposition that the ideal school will bring religion openly and obviously to bear upon its every problem, as it is to question those other propositions that the ideal business man will practice his religion positively and conspicuously in his business transactions, and that the ideal state will be a theocracy, one with the ideal church. Yet, until the millennium approaches, we shall continue to distrust the business man who tags his goods with Scripture, opens his shop with prayer, or advertises his church relationship. And in the realm of civil life it has been demonstrated that, perhaps because of that hardness of the human heart which was said to justify one of the laws of Moses, the organic theocracy is not so hopeful an approach to the Kingdom of God on Earth as the less coherent, but more susceptible, democracy. Both church and state have risen and have approached each other since they have

worked independently, each influencing the spirit with which men enter into the other, but neither claiming authority over the affairs of the other. The same principle may hold good of the church and the school. Each may have something to learn of the other. As in government so in education, the public institution, by being held down to, and up to, the essentials to which all assent, may be discovering what the essentials really are. The school may say to the church: "Show me thy faith without thy works and I will show thee my faith by my works." Such a challenge cannot be detrimental to sound faith.

On the other hand, no one will dissent from President Eliot's assertion that immorality is unintelligent, and that only righteousness is consistent with perfect intelligence. In a universe operated upon a basis of righteousness it must be presumed that the ultimate consequences of action in accordance with this basal principle will be beneficial to the doer, and the consequences of obstructive action baleful. It is conceivable, therefore, that a man dominated by an intellect which correctly presented to him the ultimate consequences of his every act, however selfish and sordid his nature, would be led to pursue the same path as would a man dominated by a spirit absolutely unselfish and perfectly responsive to the supreme will which is the motive of the universe and in which righteousness consists. It is perhaps doubtful whether there would be opportunity for the development of altruism in a race whose intelligence was so complete that it recognized no conflict between self-interest and benevolence. And yet, constituted as we are, a man does go wrong in the very matters about which he is apparently most intelligent. He deceives himself by magnifying values on the one hand and belittling them upon the other, obscuring distant consequences by dwelling upon the immediate. When once a man begins to govern his action primarily by its consequences as interpreted to him by his intellect, the greater his intellectual power the more complex are the considerations presented to him, and the greater his capacity for self-persuasion, if he permits it.

This distortion of his perspective is a moral lapse. To resist it requires moral strength. The man who is so master of himself that, to use Matthew Arnold's phrase, he does the thing he knows he ought

to do at the time when he knows he ought to do it, is morally strong. This gearing of one's action to his intelligence is the moral problem. The spirit dominates the intellect. The man must rule his spirit. Moral perception, indeed, is closely allied to reasoning, but morality is something more than quick moral perception; its essential and dynamic element is deep, moral earnestness, and earnestness is as intimately linked with the religious nature as perception is with the reasoning faculty. Genuine moral education is concerned with both.

The field of morality is the whole field of man's relation to his fellow. The domain of religion includes, indeed, the moral field, but it is centered upon man's relation to his Maker. The realm of the church is as broad as that of religion. The public school is limited to the narrower area. May the school do its full work in the field of morality without either making organic connection with the church or severing the arteries by which it is to receive the motive force which it is the business of the church to generate?

Morality that is worth having must be capable of exercise in a community made up of people of various religious faiths. The American people, as was said of the ancient Athenians, are a very religious people, but they are divided into many religious groups. These groups differ not upon the question of a man's relation to his fellow. They do not differ materially over the fact of his relation to his Maker. Their disagreement is wholly in regard to the nature of that relationship, to the methods of exercising it in worship, and to what may reverently be termed the psychology of Deity. Over these questions they are extremely sensitive, and yet so entirely subjective are their differences that men from the several groups mingle freely in social, political, and commercial intercourse, working together harmoniously in behalf of common interests, each adhering to his peculiar religious view without ever revealing one to another their several attitudes toward disputed points. These differences do not show themselves in conduct, and yet we may not doubt that each man's faith is exercising its sway over his moral conduct quite as effectively when he works shoulder to shoulder with those of other folds as when he mingles only with his own religious *confrères* in some movement undertaken in the name of his church. If, then, the children of these several religious groups are in future to mingle

thus freely, why is it not desirable that they exercise their religious training in a common practice-field, reserving to the churches those phases of religious instruction in which their differences inhere?

However at variance the tenets or the forms of worship, the moral resultant is to be applied in a single direction. There may be a difference in the degree of moral impetus, but not in the nature of the resistance to be overcome. The source of motive power is a matter of vital significance to the car-line or the factory, but the motorman and the operative may utilize the power as it is conveyed to them, regardless of whether it be generated by engine or water-wheel. So the student charged with moral power from whatever religious source, may exercise it under the same actual and ordinary conditions, and we may make use of his power without questioning the source.

Those who are being trained for life in a world made up as ours is must be practiced in a field which presents in a large degree the same variety of temperament and view that the actual world does. They must have a chance to put their religious instruction to practical test, and to bring their experiments back to the church for revision. There is danger that even a religious education which is tested only in the atmosphere of an exclusive society, whether the exclusion be upon lines of wealth, or of caste, or of religious faith, will prove disappointing when put to the test of practice in a world which disregards these lines. In the field of moral training as distinguished from moral instruction, the public school affords advantages which the church ought to appreciate, and which can scarcely be found elsewhere.

The church may fairly demand that teachers shall be, as President Wright says, interpreters of life; that out of the industries and occupations, the discouragements and the triumphs, the disappointments and successes, the mutual differences and the mutual helpfulnesses, out of all the experiences of school-life, the moral question shall be clearly put before each individual to be answered by him with all the religious light which his church may send in upon him, and that this shall be done with full deference to the religious influences under which his life is cast. Every moral tendency of the community displays itself here, and can be utilized in school without extending the scope of the school so far into that of the church as to reach the

debatable ground. But in order successfully to interpret life the teacher must, upon occasion, reinforce training with instruction, and it is upon this point of moral instruction, rather than upon that of training, that both the criticism and the protest come. Those who criticise the shortcomings of the school in this particular are the first to protest against the extension of its functions of moral instruction in the direction of its religious sources.

Yet within the limitations now fixed upon the school vastly more of moral instruction is possible than is generally appreciated. Plainly the public school may not enter into the domain of religious differences, but plainly, too, it may deal with the whole realm of the second great commandment, about which there are no differences. It may deal, too, with the first great commandment in so far as to recognize the fact of divine Fatherhood, and to inculcate reverence for the religious motive in every individual and for all things held sacred by him. Any failure to do this is proper cause for protest as being contrary to the ultimate aim of the public school as we have fathomed it. In a similar way the school may recognize and make use of the parental influence and the child's reverence for his father and mother, without venturing into an analysis of the personal qualities of the parents. That analysis the child may sometime make, but the best the school can do is to assure that when it comes to be made it shall be made with all reverence, and that meantime the helpfulness of the relationship shall be realized and employed to the utmost.

In considering whether the function of the public school, as thus outlined, is in accordance with its actual constitution and policy, it is of interest to examine a section of the Massachusetts school law which evidently has escaped the notice of our expert first cited. It dates well back toward the foundation and throws no little light upon the motive of public education.

The president, professors, and tutors of the university at Cambridge and of the several colleges, all preceptors and teachers of academies, and all other instructors of youth shall exert their best endeavors to impress on the minds of children and youth committed to their care and instruction the principles of piety and justice and a sacred regard for truth, love of their country, humanity and universal benevolence, sobriety, industry and frugality, chastity, moderation and temperance, and those other virtues which are the ornament of human society and the basis upon which a republican constitution is founded; and they shall

endeavor to lead their pupils, as their ages and capacities will admit, into a clear understanding of the tendency of the above-mentioned virtues to preserve and perfect a republican constitution and secure the blessings of liberty as well as to promote their future happiness, and also to point out to them the evil tendency of the opposite vices.¹

This eloquent statute seems to establish the school, not as an intellectual gymnasium, but as a novitiate for bringing new comers into vital relationship with the social body. President, professors, and tutors, as well as preceptors and teachers, if they are to "lead their pupils, as their ages and capacities will admit, into a clear understanding of the tendency of the above-mentioned virtues" must be, primarily, interpreters of life. This at least was the ideal of the fathers who founded the school.

In seeking to ascertain the ideals which control today in the administration of schools, we must recognize at the outset that ideals never quite materialize. In the ebb and flow of life the ideal is always somewhat aloft. The working ideal of any social group is not clearly determined in the mind of any individual member. It is a composite of the ideals of all. It is seldom formulated until it has fossilized and given place to a higher. But in this case it may be roughly discerned by observing what kind of force the school employs, the resistance it encounters, the nature of its successes, the nature, too, of its failures, and what the present-day public demands of it.

The force the school employs is spiritual force. The term is not used in a sanctimonious sense. The simple fact is that in the best schools—for the best should be the index of the ideals that control—the selection of teachers turns primarily upon the spirit displayed by the teacher in school and out, the spirit induced in the school under his charge, the spirit in which he faces his associates, his students, his duties.

And his successes are spiritual successes. The reunions of old school-boys in our larger schools bear witness to the qualities which mature men approve in their former teachers. It is not the intellectual, but the spiritual, attraction of the man that brings these old school-fellows back to honor the master of forty and fifty years' service. If we consult the master himself we shall find that the virtue

¹ *Revised Laws*, chap. 42, sec. 18.

that went out of him into those students went, not to their intellectual sharpening, but to their spiritual rounding. Follow him in his dealings with his boys of today, and see how little of his skill is displayed in securing intellectual results and how much in maintaining a sturdy, generous, and lofty spirit throughout his juvenile university community. And his growth as he ripens with years is a growth primarily of the spirit which directs his intellect. The man in whom intellectual acumen is more prominent than spiritual manhood, is not the one around whom the mature graduates rally.

The resistance overcome, too, is spiritual resistance. The labor, the wear and tear, the strain upon the life of the elementary teacher comes not from the intellectual effort to instruct the mind, but from the spiritual effort to shape the ideals and the life. Not all teachers are equally conscientious, but that conscience is the chief burden of the average teacher is the unquestionable verdict of all who are closely conversant with the conditions of our public schools and with the psychology of school teachers. Somewhat vaguely, but really and practically, the teacher's ambition is to be an interpreter of life, and to send his pupils on their way to higher living. Evidence of success in so doing is his highest reward, and evidence of failure, even in a single instance, casts the deepest gloom.

The greatest success of the school is in the moral field. The superiority of the school-child over the street-gamin is less of the intellect than of the spirit. The assimilation of immigrant populations, and the engendering in them of American ideals through the agency of the public school, is the marvel of foreign observers. Certainly the intellectual product of the public school is trifling in comparison with its recognized spiritual effect.

Again, the practical demand of the public upon its schools is for moral results. Punctuality, persistence, self-reliance, frankness, willingness, attentiveness, these are the qualities which the employer asks of the school. Given these moral attributes, he says, he will risk the intelligence. And well he may, for in them are the germs of that continuous intellectual enlargement and of all the other human conquests which President Eliot thinks should result from popular education, and the failure to secure which he records as the most serious reflection upon the efficiency of the public school.

So then the fundamental law of the public school, the demand of the present-day public upon it, the forces it employs, the resistance it overcomes, its notable successes, and its recognized failures, are all in the moral rather than in the intellectual field. The school therefore occupies either a portion or the whole of the field of the church. It becomes of necessity a subordinate, a rival, or a partner of the church. To one or the other of these relationships the church and the school must adjust themselves. This problem of adjustment has as yet received no adequate attention from either party. With the exception of the Catholic church the churches seem still to be in the attitude of spectators passing indifferent judgment upon the school, and that, too, from a greater distance than would be possible were they occupying the whole field which is theirs in theory.

The Catholic church alone has shouldered its responsibility, and has pursued a positive and definite policy. Unable to see in the public school suitable opportunity for the application and exercise of its religious teaching, that church has withdrawn large numbers of its adherents from the public school and has established parochial schools in competition with it. This has been done at an enormous sacrifice of which the money cost of the parochial schools represents but a minor part. The sacrifice of public-school privileges which belong to them, the denial to their children of advantages which their neighbors enjoy and which are important factors in education for practical life, their withdrawal from associations which would go far toward qualifying them for the associations of social and business life, these have added vastly to the burden carried by the people of that church in the education of their children. The spectacle is an imposing one, and can but excite admiration in the fair-minded observer. If the gain is commensurate with the sacrifice, other churches ought to emulate this example and the public school should go to the wall.

In all probability if the result had appeared to justify the cost, other churches would long since have embarked upon similar enterprises. But to the outside observer the achievements of the parochial school have not been at all commensurate with this magnificent sacrifice. These schools have now been in existence long enough for comparisons to be drawn. In point of intellectual training, they

do not presumably claim any superiority over the public school. The point upon which they must challenge the public school, if anywhere, is upon the character of the men and women who have passed through them. Unless they can show a material gain in moral and religious character the experiment has been a mistake.

It would be interesting to know whether the Catholic people educated in the parochial schools are, from the standpoint of the church itself, more law-abiding and public-spirited citizens, more generous and high-minded members of society, more devout and loyal church members, than those of the same antecedents educated in the public school. But even if the verdict be that they are so, the question still remains whether the church, by devoting the same energy and resources entirely to religious teaching, leaving instruction in ordinary branches to the public school, might not have accomplished as much for the children now in parochial schools, and, in addition, have reached also the great numbers of its children still in the public schools whom the parochial school does not reach; and whether it might not at the same time have lowered instead of raising those barriers of prejudice for which the Catholic people are not wholly responsible, but which it is their duty, as well as that of all other good citizens, to remove.

The expenditure which has established and maintained these schools would in the same communities have built and manned a chapel in the vicinity of every considerable public school. The same number of instructors that can teach a thousand children five hours a day could teach five thousand one hour a day. Would not the daily lesson in religion, to be put into practice in the public school, accomplish as much for the larger number of children as the all-day instruction in religion, arithmetic, geography, and grammar, for the smaller number in the parochial school? And would not the intimate and sympathetic acquaintance with the public schools, with the teachers, with the habits and tendencies of the children, thus made possible to the religious teacher, be found effective in influencing the religious life of the children in their homes? It would seem, too, that, from the standpoint of the church, the elevating influence thus brought indirectly to bear upon children not of the fold should be kept in view.

The theory of the parochial school is that religious instruction should not be a matter of times and seasons, but should pervade the whole education. Practically, however, even in the parochial schools, there must be intervals, and the question really becomes one of frequency of lessons and length of intervals. That some religious instruction should be had during the week few will be heard to question. That beyond the limits already indicated these lessons cannot be given in the public school is established with measurable certainty. But if the church were to offer its lessons to its own children upon its own territory at intervals of reasonable frequency, would not public schools as readily adjust their schedules to such lessons as they now do to the lessons of the special teachers in the several departments of school work?

Whatever the verdict of the Catholic church upon its parochial experiment, those other churches which deplore the lack in public education of an element which they themselves have in hand to contribute will do well, while emulating the zeal and resolution of the parochial movement, to devise a more practical and economical method of expending their energy, by way of supplementing, reinforcing, and inspiring the work of the public school, instead of paralleling it and competing with it.

The public school is doing a work in moral training of which the average citizen has little conception, and can have little unless he will follow patiently from day to day and year to year the progress of a group of pupils, and learn how their ideals and standards are constantly tested, modified, and elevated, as their experience, and the world's experience as presented to them in history and literature, afford occasion. It will do more when teachers are made to feel that they are to be judged by these results rather than by those more tangible but superficial ones which find their way into school exhibitions.

To lay down a moral curriculum is not the way for the church to utilize the school. That was the method of the scribes. The Great Teacher did not follow it. His way was first to awaken moral earnestness, and then to put it into exercise upon matters immediately in hand. The school affords to the churches a suitable practice-field for putting into exercise those religious teachings which can be applied

to ordinary duties and to ordinary intercourse. The forms which temptation takes are more patent in the school than in the adult community by as much as children are more transparent than adults, and this gives opportunity for counteracting evil tendencies which adults conceal. The church should find in the school an index of the moral needs of the community, and an ally in meeting them. The clergy may learn from the humble schoolmistress something about methods of reaching the recesses of the human soul, which will be of service to them both in their work with children and in dealing with those children of a larger growth who differ from the little ones less in the quality of their motives and emotions than in their ability to cloak them.

The work of the school and the work of the church both fall far short of the ideal, just as the individual fails to attain to his ideal. A great handicap upon both is that they do not yet command the services of men and women of the highest capacity, broad enough to join hands across the lines of caste and sect marked out by smaller minds, and to co-operate in all things upon which men are agreed, while working along their several lines in those upon which they are not agreed. Even now co-operation is entirely practicable in the moral field between public-school teachers of divers religious affiliations and the spiritual shepherds of their pupils. Pastors of whatever flock should have no serious difficulty in sending into the school their feed wires of moral earnestness to reinforce the moral instruction and training of the school. Nothing in the constitution of the school forbids it to employ and to accentuate the moral output of whatever church, as well as the moral influence of every home which exerts any. There is no more danger that the school will impair the spiritual hold of a church upon its children than that it will weaken the filial tie in children from the homes. Both ties are recognized reinforcements to the school, and the school in turn should lend them added strength by its emphasis upon them.

It is for the churches to study how to send into the school their dynamic impulse. To do this the clergy, like the wise parent, must first acquaint themselves with what the schools are actually doing. The parent or the pastor who proffers counsel without knowing sympathetically the burdens of those he counsels may expect the

same result as the physician who prescribes without diagnosis. Next, they must be ready to take as well as to give. Teachers may well be called into conference with the clergy upon any moral question upon which the clergy may confer among themselves, but it should be to be heard as well as to listen.

Again the public school teachers in any community may wisely be asked upon occasion to attend services in any church to listen to instruction, inspiration, or appeal. Indeed, one of the recognized and effective methods of uplifting school work is to employ from time to time, to instruct the teachers, those who have the gift of prophecy in some particular line, or upon the whole outlook. The impulse thus given is often perceptible throughout an entire system of schools. But here again the clergyman who assembles teachers to listen must prepare himself thoughtfully for the occasion. If he talks upon a theme of which he is master he may hope to wield an influence, but if he regales them with amateurish theories of school-life he must expect the same response as if he used crude nautical illustrations in a sermon to sailors.

But the pastor's great opportunity is to know the children in their school, and to let them feel his interest in, and his respect for, what they are doing there; to know their teacher, and to exchange confidences and counsel about the conditions, the tendencies, and the opportunities of the children about whom pastor and teacher are jointly concerned. And this exchange of counsel and confidence should be equally a privilege to the teacher. The teacher who does not welcome it, or who welcomes it only within the confines of his own creed, is in so far disqualified for service in a public school, and should not teach unless in a sectarian school. By such simple methods as these is power transmitted. If these are inadequate, still to utilize these to their utmost is the most direct way to find better ones.

The church in extending its sway over the organization of the school must rely upon moral influence and not upon authority. This is well for the church itself, since it must adjust itself to the same limitation in extending its influence over those organized industries in which are gathered great bodies of employees constituting media for the culture of moral germs, good and bad, as well as for the

development of the embryo of every social movement or vagary. Into these bodies of employees many of our youth are plunged upon leaving school, and if the church shall learn to take advantage of the school as an ally in developing character it will be better prepared to establish relations also with other organizations in which the life begun in school is continued, and in which character, if not the ultimate object, is at least a recognized, highly valued, and essential asset. The work which the church claims as its own will be well in hand when the church and the school bring their joint influence to bear upon the children; and when the school, the church, the subsequent employer, and the union of employees shall unite to surround the graduate with an atmosphere of purity, with a tone of intercourse keyed not to the baser, but to the sounder standards of the community.

It is a lofty conception that the One Church Invisible is the main artery through which the fountain of life pours into the world its healing waters, while the several churches are the branches for its distribution to the needs of the people. But as the world advances it becomes evident that there are channels stretching away beyond the immediate reach and purview of the churches, and that to speed the mission of the Church the churches must open their sluice-gates into these providential water-courses, using them to extend their service without delaying to secure exclusive possession, or to construct parallel water-ways, in their own several names. There is work enough for all. Let us leave the question of who is to be the greater in the Kingdom until the work is done. Meanwhile, let the churches learn to co-operate among themselves, and call into co-operation with them all other institutions whose permanent motive or transient self-interest it is to speed the better day.